arXiv:1404.2752v2 [math.CO] 11 Jan 2015

Hidden Vertices in Extensions of Polytopes

Kanstantsin Pashkovich

Université libre de Bruxelles, Département de Mathématique, Boulevard du Triomphe, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium

Stefan Weltge

Otto-von-Guericke-Universität Magdeburg, Universitätsplatz 2, D-39106 Magdeburg, Germany

Abstract

Some widely known compact extended formulations have the property that each vertex of the corresponding extension polytope is projected onto a vertex of the target polytope. In this paper, we prove that for heptagons with vertices in general position none of the minimum size extensions has this property. Additionally, for any $d \geq 2$ we construct a family of d-polytopes such that at least $\frac{1}{9}$ of all vertices of any of their minimum size extensions is not projected onto vertices.

Keywords: extended formulation, polytope, minimal extension, projection, additional vertex

1. Introduction

The theory of *extended formulations* is a fast developing research field that has connections to many other fields of mathematics. In its core, it deals with the concept of representing polytopes (usually having many facets or even no known linear description) as linear projections of other polytopes (which, preferably, permit smaller linear descriptions). Thus, polyhedral theory plays a crucial role for extended formulations establishing a natural connection to geometry.

Recall that a *polytope* is the convex hull of a finite set of points and that every polytope can be described as the solution set of a system of finitely many linear inequalities and equations. The *size* of a polytope is the number of its facets, i.e., the minimum number of inequalities in a linear description of the polytope. An alternative way to represent a polytope is to write it as a projection of another polytope. Concretely, a polytope $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is called an *extension* of a polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ if the orthogonal projection of Q on the first d coordinates

Email addresses: kanstantsin.pashkovich@gmail.com (Kanstantsin Pashkovich), weltge@ovgu.de (Stefan Weltge)



Figure 1: A hexagon (shadow) as a projection of a triangular prism.

equals P. The *extension complexity* of a polytope P is the minimum size of any extension for P. Here, we restrict extensions to be polytopes, not polyhedra, as well as projections to be orthogonal, not general affine maps. This definition simplifies the representation, however does not lead to loss of generality.

As an illustration, regular hexagons (having six facets) can be written as a projection of triangular prisms (having only five facets), see Fig. 1. It is easy to argue that such extensions are indeed of minimum size. Another textbook example is the d-dimensional *cross polytope*, which is the convex hull of all unit vectors $\mathbb{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and their negatives $-\mathbb{e}_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$. While the d-dimensional cross polytope has 2^d facets, it can be written as the projection onto the x-coordinates of the polytope

$$\left\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{2d} \,:\, x = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i \mathbb{e}_i - \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_{d+i} \mathbb{e}_i,\, \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \lambda_j = 1,\, \lambda_j \geq 0 \,\forall\, j = 1, \ldots, 2d\right\},$$

which is a $(2d-1)$-simplex (and hence has only $2d$ facets) and can also be proven to be of minimum size. Note that both examples admit minimum size extensions whose vertices are again projected to vertices.

In fact, many widely known extended formulations have the property that every vertex of the corresponding extension is projected onto a vertex of the target polytope. See, for instance, extended formulations for the parity polytope [8, 2], the permutahedron (as a projection of the Birkhoff-polytope), the cardinality indicating polytope [5], orbitopes [3], or spanning tree polytopes of planar graphs [7]. Although there are not many polytopes whose extension complexity is known exactly, most of the mentioned extensions have minimum size at least up to a constant factor. Moreover, for many of these extensions there is even a one-to-one correspondence between the vertices of the extension and the vertices of the target polytope. Clearly, a general extension might have vertices that are not projected onto vertices. Here, let us call such vertices to be *hidden vertices*. The following natural question arises: Given a polytope P, can we always find a minimum size extension Q of P that has no hidden vertices?

In this paper, we negatively answer the above question. Namely, we prove that for almost all heptagons, every minimal extension has at least one hidden vertex. Later we extend this result and construct a family of d-polytopes, $d \geq 2$, such that at least $\frac{1}{9}$ of all vertices in any minimum size extension are hidden.

Thus, in this paper we show that there are polytopes for which the minimum size of an extension without hidden vertices is strictly bigger than their extension complexity. Consider the open question: How big can be the difference between the minimum size of extensions without hidden vertices and the extension complexity? This paper demonstrates that the difference can be at least one in the context of the above question. However, the above question remains open and as the next step to study hidden vertices we propose the following question: Is there a polynomial $q : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for every polytope the minimum size of its extension without hidden vertices is at most $q(s)$, where s is the extension complexity of the polytope?

2. Minimum Extensions of Heptagons

In this section, we consider convex polygons with seven vertices taken in general position. For such polygons, we prove that there is no extension of minimum size such that every vertex of the extension is projected onto a vertex of the polygon.

2.1. Extension Complexity of Heptagons

Let us briefly recall known facts about extensions of heptagons. In 2013, Shitov [6] showed that the extension complexity of any convex heptagon is at most 6. Further, it is easy to see that any affine image of a polyhedron with only 5 facets has at most 6 vertices. Thus, one obtains:

Theorem 2.1 (Shitov [6]). *The extension complexity of any convex heptagon is* 6.

While Shitov's proof is purely algebraic, independently, Padrol and Pfeifle [4] established a geometric proof of this fact. In fact, they showed that any convex heptagon can be written as the projection of a 3-dimensional polytope with 6 facets. In order to get an idea of such a polytope, let us consider the following construction (which is a dual interpretation of the ideas of Padrol and Pfeifle):

Let P be a convex heptagon with vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_7$ in cyclic order. For $i \in \{2, 3, 5, 6, 7\}$ let us set $w_i := (v_i, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Further, choose some numbers $z_1, z_4 > 0$ such that $w_1 := (v_1, z_1)$, $w_4 := (v_4, z_4)$, w_2 and w_3 are contained in one hyperplane and consider $Q' := \operatorname{conv}(\{w_1, \ldots, w_7\})$. It can be shown [4] that (by possibly shifting the vertices' labels) one may assume that the convex hull of w_1, w_4 and w_6 forms a facet F of Q'. In this case, remove the defining inequality of F from an irredundant outer description of Q' and obtain a 3-dimensional polytope Q with only 6 facets whose projection is still P. For an illustration, see Fig. 2. Note that removing the facet F results in an additional vertex that projects into the interior of P.



Figure 2: Example of the construction of a 3-dimensional extension Q with 6 facets for a heptagon P.

In what follows, our argumentation does not rely on the construction described above but only on the statement of Theorem 2.1. However, the previous paragraph gives an intuition why additional vertices may help in order to reduce the number of facets of an extension.

2.2. Additional Vertices of Minimum Size Extensions of Heptagons

In this section, we will show that most convex heptagons force minimum size extensions to have at least one vertex that is not projected onto a vertex. In order to avoid singular cases in which it is possible to construct minimum size extensions without additional vertices, we only consider convex heptagons P that satisfy the following three conditions:

1. There are no four pairwise distinct vertices $u_1, \ldots, u_4$ of P such that the lines $\overline{u_1u_2}$, $\overline{u_3u_4}$ are parallel.
2. There are no six pairwise distinct vertices $u_1, \ldots, u_6$ of P, such that the lines $\overline{u_1u_2}$, $\overline{u_3u_4}$, $\overline{u_5u_6}$ have a point common to all three of them.
3. There are no seven pairwise distinct vertices $u_1, \ldots, u_7$ of P such that the intersection points $\overline{u_1u_2} \cap \overline{u_3u_4}$, $\overline{u_2u_5} \cap \overline{u_4u_6}$ and $\overline{u_3u_7} \cap \overline{u_1u_5}$ lie in the same line.

Here, a convex heptagon P is called to be *in general position*, if it satisfies conditions (1)–(3). We are now ready to state our main result:

Theorem 2.2. *Let P be a convex heptagon in general position. Then any minimum size extension of P has a vertex that is not projected onto a vertex of P.*

From now on, let us fix a convex heptagon P that is in general position. In order to prove Theorem 2.2, let us assume, for the sake of contradiction, that there exists a polytope Q with only six facets such that Q is an extension of P and every vertex of Q is projected onto a vertex of P. Towards this end, let us first formulate two Lemmas, which we will extensively use through the whole consideration.



Figure 3: Labeling of the vertices of Γ.

Lemma 1. *Let $w_1, \ldots, w_4$ be four pairwise distinct vertices of Q such that exactly one pair of them is projected onto the same vertex of P. Then, the dimension of the affine space generated by $w_1, \ldots, w_4$ equals 3.*

Proof. Let us assume the contrary and let $w_1, \ldots, w_4$ be such vertices of Q that the dimension of the corresponding affine space is at most 2. Then, the dimension of the affine space generated by the projections of $w_1, \ldots, w_4$ is at most one since it is the projection of the affine space generated by $w_1, \ldots, w_4$, while two distinct points in this space are projected onto the same point. This implies that the projections of $w_1, \ldots, w_4$, and thus three different vertices of P, lie on the same line, a contradiction.

Lemma 2. *There are no six vertices $w_1, \ldots, w_6$ of Q such that*

- *at most one pair of them is projected onto the same point, and*
- $\mathrm{conv}(\{w_1, \ldots, w_6\})$ *is a triangular prism.*

Proof. Let $w_1, \ldots, w_6$ be any six vertices of Q that form a triangular prism Γ. We claim that two of them are projected onto the same point. Otherwise, label the vertices of Γ as in Fig. 3. The lines $\overline{w_1w_2}$ and $\overline{w_3w_4}$ are not skew, since the points w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4 lie in the same facet of Γ. By condition (1), the lines $\overline{w_1w_2}$ and $\overline{w_3w_4}$ are not parallel, since otherwise the lines $\overline{u_1u_2}$ and $\overline{u_3u_4}$ are parallel, where u_i denotes the projection of w_i for $i = 1, \ldots, 6$. Thus, the lines $\overline{w_1w_2}$ and $\overline{w_3w_4}$ have a unique common point. Analogously, the lines $\overline{w_3w_4}$ and $\overline{w_5w_6}$ have a unique common point. Note, that the points $\overline{w_1w_2} \cap \overline{w_3w_4}$ and $\overline{w_3w_4} \cap \overline{w_5w_6}$ lie in the hyperplane corresponding to the facet of Γ containing w_1, w_2, w_5 and w_6, since the lines $\overline{w_1w_2}$ and $\overline{w_5w_6}$ lie in this hyperplane. Since the line $\overline{w_3w_4}$ is not contained in this hyperplane, it has at most one common point with this hyperplane, showing that $\overline{w_1w_2} \cap \overline{w_3w_4} = \overline{w_3w_4} \cap \overline{w_5w_6}$. Hence, the lines $\overline{u_1u_2}$, $\overline{u_3u_4}$ and $\overline{u_5u_6}$ have a point common to all three of them, which contradicts condition (2).

Suppose now that exactly one pair of vertices of Γ is projected onto the same point. Let us denote this point by u. Since u is a vertex of the projection of Γ, the set of all points of Γ that project onto u forms a face of Γ. This face contains exactly two vertices of Γ, which therefore have to share an edge of Γ. But any edge of Γ is contained in a two-dimensional face of Γ with four vertices, a contradiction to Lemma 1.

Since the polytope Q has only 6 facets, its dimension cannot exceed 5. In the case $\dim(Q) = 5$, the polytope Q would be a simplex and hence would have only 6 vertices. Note that any polytope that projects down to a convex heptagon must have at least 7 vertices. Thus, we have to consider the remaining two cases $\dim(Q) = 3$ and $\dim(Q) = 4$.

2.2.1. Three-Dimensional Extensions

In dimension 3, there are four combinatorial types of polytopes with 6 facets and at least 7 vertices (see [1]), which are illustrated in Fig. 4.



Figure 4: Combinatorial types of three dimensional polytopes with at most 6 facets and at least 7 vertices.

- If Q is of type A or B, then it has 8 vertices of which exactly one pair of them is projected onto the same vertex u of P. Thus, the preimage of u induces a face of Q containing exactly two vertices of Q, hence these two vertices must share an edge. Since any edge of Q is contained in a 2-dimensional face of Q with at least 4 vertices, this yields a contradiction to Lemma 1.

- If Q is of type C, then it has 7 vertices and thus no two of them are projected on the same point. Note that six vertices of Q form a triangular prism, a contradiction to Lemma 2.

- If Q is of type D, then due to counting, again no two of its vertices are projected on the same point. Label the vertices of Q by $w_1, \ldots, w_7$ as denoted in Fig. 5 and let u_i denote the projection of w_i for $i = 1, \ldots, 7$.

  The lines $\overline{w_1w_2}$ and $\overline{w_3w_4}$ are not skew since they lie in the same facet of Q. By condition (1), the lines $\overline{w_1w_2}$ and $\overline{w_3w_4}$ are not parallel, since otherwise the lines $\overline{u_1u_2}$ and $\overline{u_3u_4}$ are parallel. Thus, we have that the lines $\overline{w_1w_2}$ and $\overline{w_3w_4}$ have a unique common point. Analogously, one obtains that $\overline{w_1w_5} \cap \overline{w_3w_7}$ and $\overline{w_2w_5} \cap \overline{w_4w_6}$ each consists of a single point.

  Moreover, the points $\overline{w_1w_2} \cap \overline{w_3w_4}$, $\overline{w_1w_5} \cap \overline{w_3w_7}$ and $\overline{w_2w_5} \cap \overline{w_4w_6}$ belong to the intersection of the hyperplane generated by w_1, w_2, w_5 and the hyperplane generated by w_3, w_4, w_6, w_7; i.e. the points $\overline{w_1w_2} \cap \overline{w_3w_4}$, $\overline{w_1w_5} \cap \overline{w_3w_7}$ and $\overline{w_2w_5} \cap \overline{w_4w_6}$ lie in the same line. Hence, $u_1, \ldots, u_7$ violate condition (3).



Figure 5: Treatment of case D.

2.2.2. Four-Dimensional Extensions

In dimension 4, every polytope with exactly 6 vertices is the convex hull of a union of a 4-simplex with one point. Dualizing this observation yields that every 4-polytope with exactly 6 facets is combinatorially equivalent to a 4-simplex Δ intersected with one closed affine half-space H. The combinatorial structure of such an intersection is completely defined by the number k of the vertices of Δ lying on the boundary of H and the number t of the vertices of Δ lying outside of H. In this case, the total number of vertices of Q equals

$$(5-t)+(5-k-t)t,$$

i.e. $5-t$ vertices of Δ are vertices of Q and all other vertices of Q are intersections of the edges between the t vertices of Δ lying outside of H and $5-k-t$ vertices of Δ lying strictly inside of H. Since the number of vertices of Q should be at least 7, there are five possibilities for the pair (k,t), namely $(0,1)$, $(1,1)$, $(0,2)$, $(1,2)$ and $(0,3)$. In order to finally rule out the existence of Q, by Lemma 2, it suffices to show that in each of these cases, Q contains a triangular prism as a facet of which at most one pair of vertices is projected onto the same point.

- $(k,t) \in \{(0,1), (1,1), (1,2), (0,3)\}$: In these cases, the number of vertices of Q is at most 8 and thus, at most one pair of vertices of Q is projected onto the same point. There exists a facet F of Δ such that none of its vertices lies on the boundary of H and one or two of its vertices lie outside of H. Consider the facet $F' := F \cap H$ of Q, which is a 3-simplex intersected with one half-space. In particular, by the choice of F, F' is a triangular prism.

- $(k,t) = (0,2)$: In this case, Q has exactly 9 vertices. Let w be a vertex of Q such that its projection coincides with the projection of another vertex of Q. Let F be a facet of Δ that does not contain w. Then at most one pair of vertices of the facet $F \cap H$ of Q is projected onto the same point. To finish the proof, note that for $(k,t) = (0,2)$ the intersection of every facet of Δ with the half-space H is a triangular prism.

3. Higher Dimensional Constructions

We will end our paper by showing that heptagons in general position are not the only polytopes that force minimum size extensions to have hidden vertices. In fact, Theorem 3.1 yields families of polytopes in arbitrary dimensions for which, in any minimum size extension, at least a constant fraction of its vertices are hidden.

Lemma 3. *Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ be a polytope and $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{(p+1)+q}$ a minimum size extension of $P \times [0,1]$. Then, the sets*

$$F_0 := \{(x,y) \in Q : x \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1},\, y \in \mathbb{R}^q,\, x_{p+1} = 0\}$$
$$F_1 := \{(x,y) \in Q : x \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1},\, y \in \mathbb{R}^q,\, x_{p+1} = 1\}$$

are both minimum size extensions of P.

Proof. Note that F_0 and F_1 are both extensions of P and proper faces of Q. Let k denote the number of facets of Q and t be the extension complexity of P. Clearly, we have that $k \leq t+2$ holds. For $i \in \{0,1\}$ let $f_i \geq t$ be the number of facets of F_i and let us define the sets

$$\mathcal{C}_i := \{F : F \text{ facet of } Q,\, F_i \subseteq F\}$$
$$\mathcal{D}_i := \{F : F \text{ facet of } Q,\, F_i \cap F = \emptyset\}.$$

It is straightforward to see that

$$f_i \leq k - |\mathcal{C}_i| - |\mathcal{D}_i| \leq (t+2) - |\mathcal{C}_i| - |\mathcal{D}_i| \tag{1}$$

holds. Thus, it remains to show that $|\mathcal{C}_i| + |\mathcal{D}_i| \geq 2$ holds for $i = 0, 1$. Clearly, this inequality holds if neither F_0 is a facet nor is F_1, since this implies $|\mathcal{C}_i| \geq 2$ for $i = 0, 1$.

Towards this end, by symmetry, it remains to consider the case that F_0 is a facet of Q. Since $|\mathcal{C}_i| \geq 1$ for $i = 0, 1$, it is enough to show that in this case we have $|\mathcal{D}_i| \geq 1$ for $i = 0, 1$. Indeed, since F_0 and F_1 are disjoint, we obtain $F_0 \in \mathcal{D}_1$ and thus $|\mathcal{D}_1| \geq 1$. Due to $t \leq f_1$ and inequality (1), it holds that $|\mathcal{C}_1| + |\mathcal{D}_1| \leq 2$ and hence $|\mathcal{C}_1| = 1$. Thus, F_1 has to be a facet, too. Moreover, the facet F_1 is in $\mathcal{D}_0$, and thus $|\mathcal{D}_0| \geq 1$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let P be a convex heptagon in general position and Q a minimum size extension for $P \times [0,1]^d$. Then, for at least $\frac{1}{9}$ of the vertices of Q, we have that none of them is projected onto a vertex of $P \times [0,1]^d$.*

Proof. We will prove the statement by induction over $d \geq 0$. In the case of $d = 0$, by Theorem 2.2 and its proof, we know that Q has at most 9 vertices and that at least one of them is not projected onto a vertex of P.

For $d \geq 1$, let $P' := P \times [0,1]^{d-1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and Q be a minimum size extension of $P \times [0,1]^d = P' \times [0,1] \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+2}$. Observe that the vertex set of $P' \times [0,1]$ is

the cartesian product of the vertex set of P' and the set $\{0,1\}$. Let us partition the set V of vertices of Q into the three sets

$$V_0 := \{(x,y) \in V : x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+2},\, y \in \mathbb{R}^q,\, x_{d+2} = 0\}$$
$$V_1 := \{(x,y) \in V : x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+2},\, y \in \mathbb{R}^q,\, x_{d+2} = 1\}$$
$$V_\star := \{(x,y) \in V : x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+2},\, y \in \mathbb{R}^q,\, 0 < x_{d+2} < 1\}$$

Clearly, no vertex in $V_\star$ is projected onto a vertex of $P' \times [0,1]$. By Lemma 3, $\mathrm{conv}(V_0)$ and $\mathrm{conv}(V_1)$ are minimum size extensions of P'. By induction, for at least $\frac{1}{9}(|V_0| + |V_1|)$ of $V_0 \cup V_1$, we have that none of them is projected onto a vertex of $P' \times [0,1]$. Thus, the number of vertices that are not projected onto a vertex is at least $\frac{1}{9}(|V_0| + |V_1|) + |V_\star| \geq \frac{1}{9}|V|$.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Samuel Fiorini for valuable comments on this work.

[1] Doyle Britton and Jack David Dunitz. A complete catalogue of polyhedra with eight or fewer vertices. *Acta Crystallographica Section A: Crystal Physics, Diffraction, Theoretical and General Crystallography*, 29(4):362–371, 1973.

[2] Robert D. Carr and Goran Konjevod. Polyhedral combinatorics. In *Tutorials on emerging methodologies and applications in Operations Research*, chapter 2, pages 2–1. Springer, 2005.

[3] Yuri Faenza and Volker Kaibel. Extended formulations for packing and partitioning orbitopes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 34(3):686–697, 2009.

[4] Arnau Padrol and Julian Pfeifle. Polygons as slices of higher-dimensional polytopes. Preprint, `arXiv:1404.2443`, 2014.

[5] Kanstantsin Pashkovich. *Extended Formulations for Combinatorial Polytopes*. PhD thesis, University of Magdeburg, 2012.

[6] Yaroslav Shitov. An upper bound for nonnegative rank. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 122:126 – 132, 2014.

[7] Justin C. Williams. A linear-size zero-one programming model for the minimum spanning tree problem in planar graphs. *Networks*, 39(1):53–60, 2002.

[8] Mihalis Yannakakis. Expressing combinatorial optimization problems by linear programs. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 43(3):441–466, 1991.